This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 21, 2007. Claims 12-23 are presented for examination, of which Claims 12, 13, 16, 17, 20 and 21 are in independent form. Claims 1-11 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 12-23 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,361,332 (Yoshida).

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0002063 (Oomura et al.).

Cancellation of Claims 1-11 renders their rejections moot, but Applicant submits the following comments regarding the patentability of new Claims 12-23 over these cited references.

Claim 12 is directed to a font downloading apparatus, including: (1) a designation unit, configured to designate a font; (2) a selection unit, configured to select a code system from among code systems utilizable by a printer; (3) a conversion unit, configured to convert a code system of a font designated by the designation unit in conformity with a code system selected by the selection unit; and (4) a download unit, configured to download to the printer the font of which the code system is converted by the conversion unit.

Among other notable features of Claim 12 are: (1) a conversion unit, configured to convert a code system of a font designated by the designation unit in conformity with a code system selected by the selection unit; and (2) a download unit, configured to

7

download to the printer the font of which the code system is converted by the conversion unit. By virtue of the structure recited in Claim 12, a font having a code system that can not be used originally by a printer can be converted to a form usable the printer.

Yoshida relates to an information outputting method for an information processing device including the step of determining whether or not an outline font to be downloaded can be developed in accordance with a development format of a printer. If the outline font can be so developed, the outline font itself is downloaded. If it cannot be developed, it is determined whether or not the outline font can be converted into an outline font having a format that can be developed in accordance with a development format of a printer. If the outline font can be converted into another such format, the outline font is converted into such format and downloaded in the converted format. If the outline font cannot be converted into another such format, the outline font is converted into a bitmap format and the bitmap format is downloaded. In Yoshida, a data format of an outline font is converted, not a code system of the font. Thus, nothing in Yoshida teaches or suggests "a conversion unit, configured to convert a code system of a font designated by said designation unit in conformity with a code system selected by said selection unit" and "a download unit, configured to download to the printer the font of which the code system is converted by said conversion unit," as recited in Claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 12 is is allowable over Yoshida.

A review of the other art of record, including Oomura, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 12.

Independent Claims 16 and 20 are method and program claims, respectively,

corresponding to apparatus Claim 12, and are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 12.

Claim 13 is directed to a font downloading apparatus, including: (1) a first obtainment unit, configured to obtain first code systems utilizable by a printer to which a font is to be downloaded; (2) a designation unit, configured to designate a font; (3) a second obtainment unit, configured to obtain a second code system of a font designated by the designation unit; (4) a determination unit, configured to determine whether or not the second code system is included in the first code systems; (5) a conversion unit, configured to, when the second code system is determined to be included in the first code systems, convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer, when the second code system is determined to be not included in the first code systems, select a code system from among the first code systems, convert a code system of the font designated by the designation unit in conformity with the selected code system, and then convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer; and (6) a download unit, configured to download to the printer the font of which the code system is converted by the conversion unit or the font of which the code system and the data format are converted by the conversion unit.

For substantially the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 12, nothing in Yoshida teaches or suggests "a conversion unit, configured to, when the second code system is determined to be included in the first code systems, convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer, when the second code system is determined to be not included in the first code systems, select a code system from among the first code systems, convert a code system of the font designated by said designation unit in conformity with the

9

selected code system, and then convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer" or "a download unit, configured to download to the printer the font of which the code system is converted by said conversion unit or the font of which the code system and the data format are converted by said conversion unit," as recited in Claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 13 is is allowable over Yoshida.

A review of the other art of record, including Oomura, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 13.

Independent Claims 17 and 21 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 13, and are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 13.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1532611v1